

JUN 10 2008

60,469-244; OT 5138

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the remarks and analysis contained in the Office Action. Claims 1, 3-4, and 9 are amended. New Claim 12 is presented. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Applicant is unsure which boxes of figures 1-5 require corrected labeling, since there are no electronic "black boxes" in the figures. The rectangular elements in application drawings are all structural elements. If the Examiner could communicate which boxes he feels require labels, Applicant will make appropriate changes.

Applicant has amended Claim 9 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claim 9 is dependent on Claim 3, and is not dependent on Claim 1 as originally stated.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) based upon *Kobayashi et al.* Claim 1 has been amended to include, "wherein said drive sheave axis and said deflection sheave axes are parallel to an outer wall of said car." *Kobayashi et al.* does not disclose this feature. Because of this, *Kobayashi et al.* cannot be interpreted in a manner to be consistent with Applicant's claims. Therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of anticipation.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 2-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 based upon *Kobayashi et al.* in view of *Yasuda et al.*, as there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness. *Yasuda et al.* does not disclose a bedplate upon which the connecting members are attached, a feature which is disclosed in this application. Furthermore, in the instances where *Yasuda et al.* utilizes deflection sheaves, they are not positioned such that the axes of all deflection sheaves are parallel to the axis of the traction sheave, and that connecting members are substantially vertical and contained within a plane perpendicular to an outer surface of the wall defining the space between the elevator car and the wall that receives said machine, features whose importance is stressed by Applicant. Moreover, the drive arrangements of the two references are so different there would be no reason to look to one to modify the other.

Applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would facilitate moving this case forward to being issued,

60,469-244; OT 5138  
Applicant's representative will be happy to discuss any issues regarding this application and can be contacted at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Theodore W. Olds, Reg. No. 33,080  
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds  
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: June 10, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, fax number (571) 273-8300, on June 10, 2008.



Laura Combs